DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 791 SP 030 099

AUTHOR	Lavely, Carolyn; And Others
TITLE	A Descriptive Profile of the Florida Associate Master Teacher.
INSTITUTION	University of South Florida, Tampa.
PUB DATE	[86]
NOTE	32p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Educational Background; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrichment Activities; *Leadership Qualities; *Master Teachers; Professional Associations; *Professional Development; Teacher Background; *Teacher Characteristics; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida Master Teacher Program; *Institute for Instructional Research and Practice

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted of participants in the 1984/85 Florida Master Teacher Program to determine variables on which award recipients and non-recipients differed, apart from the superior scores obtained on the content area tests and/or the performance evaluation. A descriptive profile of the Associate Master Teacher was developed from the results of the survey. A total of 1,903 Associate Master Teachers responded to the survey questionnaire. A description of the respondent sample is given in this report, followed by an analysis of program participants' responses in the following broad areas: (1) demographic characteristics; (2) academic background; (3) teaching experience; (4) professional growth and development activities; (5) degree and nature of involvement and leadership roles in professional organizations; (6) previous professional awards or recognition received; and (7) certification fields. A number of significant features contributing to a profile of the Florida Associate Master Teacher are presented. Data from the survey are presented in tables. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

A Descriptive Profile of the Florida Associate Master Teacher

Carolyn Lavely, Neal Berger, Donna Bullock, John Follman,
Constance Hines, Jeffrey D. Kromrey, Shlomo Sawilowsky

Institute for Instructional Research and Practice/
Content Area Teacher Tests

University of South Florida

ED292791

SP030099

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Follman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Widespread public concerns that have been voiced over the last decade about the quality of American public school education have not gone unheeded. In recent years we have evidenced various attempts at the national, state and local levels to recommend or institute education reforms in order to achieve the desired improvement in our schools. Many of the current reform proposals have focused on the teacher. These range from upgrading the quality of teacher preparation programs to improving teachers' salaries and working conditions and differentiating career opportunities (see for example, NCATE Redesign, 1985; Carnegie Forum Report, 1986; Tommorrow's Teachers, Holmes Group Report, 1986; Visions of Reform, ATE Blue Ribbon Task Force Report, 1986). It is often argued that the ability to attract, train, and retain good teachers in the profession depends to a large extent on the incentives, organizational conditions under which teachers work, and the opportunities for professional growth and development that are provided.

In responding to the recent call for improvement in the quality of education in the public schools some state legislatures and school districts have instituted merit pay or career ladder plans as part of the solution to the problems in public education. The intent of these plans is to provide monetary incentives to teachers who demonstrate superior performance in the classroom or to pay teachers higher salaries according to differences in functions.

Merit pay plans are not new to the profession, indeed they

have been tried in one form or another for more than half a century (Johnson, 1984). The merit pay concept has enjoyed a great deal of public and political support though it has been rejected by many educators and teacher unions as an effective means of achieving the desired ends (Johnson, 1984; Rosenholtz, 1985; Shanker, 1985). In 1983, President Reagan in a speech at Seton Hall University urged "Teachers should be paid and promoted on the basis of their merit and competence. Hard earned tax dollars should encourage the best. They have no business rewarding incompetence and mediocrity."[1] This rationale notwithstanding, there are two major challenges that face those charged with initiating and implementing a merit pay program, (1) that of determining adequate criteria to be used to identify these superior teachers and (2) that of determining who will be involved in the selection process.

In 1984, the Florida Legislature, as part of its program to improve the quality of public school education in the state, enacted the Florida Master Teacher Program designed to reward teachers who demonstrated superior knowledge and performance in their field. Two categories of teachers were identified for receiving monetary incentives, the Associate Master Teacher and the Master Teacher. The criteria for identifying these superior teachers and the means by which they were to be selected were established by state law. They are as follows:

---

1. Speech at Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J., May 1983.

Associate Master Teacher: To qualify as an Associate Master Teacher, a teacher must (1) have four years teaching experience of which two years minimum must be in-state, (2) document either an in-field masters degree or its vocational equivalent or document a superior score on a subject area examination when such an examination is developed by the Institute for Instructional Research and Practice and approved by the State Board of Education, (3) document a superior performance evaluation on a State Board of Education approved evaluation instrument administered by the principal.[2]

Master Teacher: To qualify as a Master Teacher, the teacher should (1) have completed seven years of teaching, (2) hold a professional service or continuing contract, and (3) served three years as an Associate Master Teacher.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to survey participants in the 1984/85 Florida Master Teacher Program to determine if there were other critical variables on which award recipients and non-recipients differed, apart from obtaining superior scores on the content area tests and/or the performance evaluation, and to develop a descriptive profile of the Associate Master Teacher.

The factors investigated were demographic characteristics, academic background, certification areas, teaching experience, professional growth and development activities, degree and nature of involvement and leadership roles in professional organizations, and previous professional awards and recognition received.

---

2. A "superior score" was defined as being at or above the 75th percentile on the subject area test and performance evaluation. The State Board Rule required two performance assessments to be conducted, only one of which was conducted by the candidate's principal.

Procedure

Population and Sample

All participants in the 1984/85 Florida Master Teacher Program comprised the population for this study. A stratified random sample was selected from this population using the following procedures. First, the population was divided into two strata, one stratum consisted of the teachers awarded Associate Master Teacher Status, the other stratum contained the non-Associate Master Teachers. Each stratum was then subdivided by subject area. Forty percent of the Associate Master Teachers (AMTs) and 20% of the non-Associate Master Teachers (non-AMTS) in each subject area were randomly selected for inclusion in the sample. In instances where there were relatively few teachers in a given subject field (30 or fewer), all participants in that area were included in the sample in an attempt to insure that the final respondent sample would include participants from that field. Altogether, 4,449 teachers (1205 AMTs and 3244 non-AMTs) were selected for inclusion in the sample. The procedure used insured that a representative sample of program participants (AMTs and non-AMTs) was selected across subject fields and districts.

Instrumentation

The survey questionnaire used for data collection was designed to obtain information from respondents on selected demographic variables (age, sex, ethnic background, years of teaching

experience, in-state and out-of-state), academic qualifications (including academic degrees earned, major college or department, degree granting institution(s) and state(s) within which located), areas of certification, teaching assignments over the five years prior to program participation, professional growth and development activities, professional and civic awards and honors received. Teachers' perceptions of who should be involved in the planning and development of content area tests, what sources should be used, and the characteristics and role of an Associate Master Teacher were also solicited. The questionnaire contained 29 items, including both open and closed format. To preserve anonymity of respondents, questionnaires were precoded prior to mailing only to identify respondents' subject field and award status (AMT vs. non-AMT).

Data Collection

The questionnaire was mailed to the sample of teachers (N=4449) with a cover letter which included a brief description of the purpose of the study and a request for participation. Subjects were asked to return the completed instrument by a specific date in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided. A single follow-up was conducted.

Results and Discussion

For the purposes of this report, results pertaining to selected aspects of the survey will be reported. A description of the

respondent sample is given followed by an analysis of program participants' responses in five broad areas -- demographic characteristics, academic background, teaching experience, professional growth and development activities, degree of involvement and leadership roles in professional organizations, and previous professional awards or recognition received. Responses of the teachers surveyed suggest a tentative profile of the Florida Associate Master Teacher.

Description of Respondent Sample

A total of 1903 teachers surveyed returned completed questionnaires yielding an overall return rate of 43%. A breakdown by award group (AMT vs. non-AMT) shows a 69% (N=837) and 33% (N=1066) return rate for the Associate Master Teacher and non-Associate Master Teacher groups, respectively. The return rate for the respondents in each of five subject fields, Elementary Education, English Education, Exceptional Child Education, Mathematics Education, and Science Education is reported in Table 1. These five subject areas were selected for study because content area tests were administered in these areas and the number of program participants and respondents were sufficiently large ($N \geq 40$) to allow for meaningful within subject field comparisons. As is shown, the return rate across these subject fields ranged from 62% to 29%.

A comparison of the respondent sample data with the total population data (obtained from the Department of Education Master Teacher Program files) was conducted to ascertain the

representativeness of the respondent group on selected demographic variables (gender, ethnicity, and years of teaching experience). In general, the survey respondent sample was quite similar to the underlying total population. The gender composition of the survey respondent sample was 77% female and 23% male, while that of the population of program participants was 78% female and 22% male. With respect to award status, the proportion of male and female non-AMTs in the respondent sample was quite similar to that in the population, however, the proportion of male AMTs in the respondent sample (19%) was higher than that in the total population (15%).

The respondent data were also compared with the population data on ethnic distribution. There was a slightly higher representation of white respondents (95%) and a lower representation of black respondents (3%) in the survey sample than in the total population (89% white vs. 9% black). A within group comparison (AMT vs non-AMT) shows that the disproportionality in ethnic distribution between the respondent sample and the total population was localized in the non-AMT group. The Associate Master Teachers were not significantly different in ethnic representation in the survey respondent sample when compared to the population of Associate Master Teachers in Florida.

The final comparison with population data was on candidates' years of teaching experience. The sample respondents as a group reported more years of teaching experience than the population of candidates. The median number of years of teaching experience in the respondent sample was 15 years as compared to 13 years in the population. A breakdown by award status showed that, in the

population, the median length of experience was 13 years for both AMTs and non-AMTs. In the respondent sample, the median number of years of teaching experience for AMTs was 14 years while that for the non-AMT respondents was 16 years.

Although in a few instances the comparisons of the respondent sample to the population reveal some disproportionality of survey respondents on the variables of interest (e.g., years of teaching experience), the magnitude is typically quite small and is not consistently attributable to either the AMT group or the non-AMT group.

Demographic Characteristics of Associate and Non-Associate Master Teachers

Survey respondents were compared on three demographic characteristics: gender, ethnic background, and age. Overall, a significantly higher proportion of females (81%) was awarded Associate Master Teacher Status than males (19%) compared with the non-Associate Master Teacher group (75% female vs. 25% male). Gender distributions within subject areas were also examined. As shown in Table 2, the pattern of disproportionality was not observed across all subject areas. In the Science Education sample, the proportion of males and females is consistent in both the AMT and non-AMT groups, while in English Education a greater proportion of males received AMT status (16%) than those denied AMT status (12%).

Respondents' age distributions were also examined. The

recipients of the Master Teacher awards tend to be somewhat younger than the non-recipients ($p<.01$). Forty-eight percent of the AMTs were under 40 years of age while only 39% of the non-AMTs were in this age group. This tendency for the AMTs to be somewhat younger was consistent across four of the five subject areas. In Mathematics, the one exception, about 50% of each group was under 40.

Applicants' ethnic background appears unrelated to AMT status (Table 3). The overwhelming majority of both recipients and non-recipients were white (95% and 93% respectively). The chi-square test on the ethnic categories did not reach the .05 level of significance. This ethnic pattern is consistent across the five subject areas examined, with the percentage of white respondents ranging from a low of 91% (Exceptional Child Education, non-AMTs) to a high of 99% (Exceptional Child Education AMTs).

Academic Background

Three aspects of respondents' academic background were examined: highest academic degree earned, college or department from which each respondent's undergraduate degree was earned, and location of the degree granting institution (in-state vs. out-of-state).

Academic Degrees. Table 4 presents the highest academic degree(s) earned by respondents. Academic degrees were dichotomized into undergraduate (bachelor's) and graduate (M.A.,

more likely to have obtained a graduate degree than the non-AMT respondents ($p<.01$). Eighty-one percent of the AMTs report at least one graduate degree, compared to 74% of the non-recipients. This pattern was also observed in four of the five subject areas examined. In the field of Science, however, fewer AMTs (76%) reported having obtained a graduate degree than non-AMTs (78%). Among the five subject fields examined, graduate degrees were most prevalent in Exceptional Child Education, where 82% of the AMTs and 80% of the non-AMTs reported at least one graduate degree. Elementary Education showed the lowest percentage of respondents with graduate training (70% of the AMTs and 61% of the non-AMTs).

Undergraduate degree granting institutions. With respect to undergraduate preparation, Associate Master Teachers are more likely to have been awarded their Bachelor's Degree from a university or college within the state of Florida than non-Associate Master Teachers (Table 5). Fifty-seven percent of the AMTs reported receiving their undergraduate degree from institutions in Florida compared to 50% of the non-AMTs, a difference significant at the .01 level. This pattern was consistent across the five separate subject areas studied. The percentages of AMTs who received their undergraduate degrees in-state ranged from 52% (Science Education) to 65% (Exceptional Child Education). Conversely, the percentages of non-AMTs with bachelor's degrees from institutions in the state of Florida ranged from 41% (English Education) to 55% (Exceptional Child Education).

Table 6 presents the number and percentages of respondents

who received their undergraduate degrees from colleges of education and other colleges. The majority of both AMTs (70%) and non-AMTs (72%) reported receiving their bachelor's degree from colleges of education. The chi-square test of these proportions was not significant, indicating that award status was independent of college from which respondents earned their undergraduate degree. Examination of the data in the five subject areas showed variations across fields in the proportions of candidates receiving their undergraduate degrees from colleges of education. In both Elementary and Exceptional Child Education, most respondents (76% - 94%) reported receiving their undergraduate degrees from colleges of education. In the secondary education fields (English, Mathematics, and Science), smaller proportions of respondents received their degrees from colleges of education. In the Science areas, for example, only 42% of the AMTs and 44% of the non-AMTs received their undergraduate degrees from colleges of education. In English and Mathematics 51% and 60% respectively of the respondents received their undergraduate degrees from colleges of education.

Certification Areas and Teaching Experience

Certification. The relationship of teacher certification with AMT status was examined by considering the number of areas in which respondents were certified to teach. Examination of these data (Table 7) reveal a tendency for Associate Master Teachers to be certified in relatively fewer areas (one to three) than the

non-recipients. Thirty-one percent of the AMTs were certified in a single subject area, while only 13% were certified to teach in four or more areas. Conversely, 28% of the non-AMT respondents were certified in a single area, while 20% were certified to teach in four or more areas. Slightly more than half of the respondents in both groups were certified to teach in two or three subject areas. This pattern of certification was consistent across four of the five subject areas examined. In Elementary Education, however, approximately the same percentages of AMTs and non-AMTs (9% and 8%, respectively) were certified to teach in four or more areas. In addition, a higher proportion of non-AMTs (35%) reported a single area of certification as compared to 26% for the AMT respondents.

Teaching Experience. Respondents' teaching experience was examined through four measures: number of years teaching in the respondent's current district, number of years teaching in Florida, number of years teaching in another state, and overall years of teaching experience. In the respondent sample, non-AMTs reported on the average one year more experience than did the AMTs. In the total population, however, the median number of years of total teaching experience for both the AMT and non-AMT groups was 13 years. Further, almost all teaching experience among all candidates occurred in the respondents' current district and fewer than one half of the respondents reported any experience out of Florida. In the area of Mathematics, the AMTs reported on average two years more experience than the non-AMTs, while in English and Science the median number of years of experience was the same for

both groups. In two of the five specific subject fields examined (Elementary Education and Exceptional Child Education) the non-AMT group reported on the average one to two years more experience than the AMTs. It is of interest to note that in the field of Exceptional Child Education, respondents had fewer years of teaching experience than in the other four subject areas examined.

The tendency for candidates' experience to be obtained in a single district and the tendency to report no out of state teaching experience is consistent across all five areas. Overall, years of teaching experience was not significantly related to award status (AMT vs. non-AMT).

Professional Activities

Professional Development. Responses were solicited on each of eight methods/sources of information teachers typically use to keep abreast of developments in their respective fields. Table 8 summarizes the total group responses in this regard. As is shown in the table, of the eight methods investigated, collegial discussion and in-service workshops were the most frequently cited as being used by both groups (AMTs and non-AMTs) to keep abreast of knowledge in their fields. In addition, a significantly higher proportion ($p<.01$) of Associate Master Teachers compared to non-Associate Master Teachers reported attendance at professional conferences, use of college texts, and taking college courses as means through which they kept abreast of knowledge in their fields. Sixty-two percent of the AMTs reported attendance at

professional conferences as a means of remaining current in the field, while only 53% of the non-AMTs reported this source. Similarly, 56% of the AMTs reported taking college courses and 39% reported reference to college texts as means of keeping abreast in their fields. In contrast, only 48% of the non-AMTs reported taking college courses, and 28% reported use of college texts to remain current. Both groups reported approximately equal use of district and state materials (64% of the AMTs and 62% of the non-AMTs), student textbooks (44% of the AMTs and 45% of the non-AMTs), and attendance at summer institutes (38% of the AMTs and 40% of the non-AMTs). Respondents were asked to indicate other sources used to help them keep abreast of information in their field. Several respondents (AMTs and non-AMTs) reported reading professional journals in their fields.

Professional Activities. Respondents were asked about their frequency and level of participation in five professional activities: conducting in-service workshops; curriculum development projects; state or district test development projects; supervision of teacher interns; and paper presentations at conferences or workshops. The results for the respondents are presented in Table 9. A significantly higher proprtion of AMTs reported more involvement in three of the five professional activities listed than did the non-AMTs. Specifically, the Associate Master Teachers were more likely to have conducted inservice workshops (48% vs. 38% for non-AMTs), to have participated in curriculum development projects (62% vs. 56% for non-AMTs), and to have supervised interns (47% vs. 41% for non-AMTs)

than the non-recipients. In these three activities, obtained differences in participation rates between the two groups yielded chi-square statistics with associated probabilities of less than .01. In the remaining two professional activities, rates across groups were nearly identical. Twenty-one percent of the AMTs report participation in state or district test development, contrasted with 20% of the non-AMTs. On professional paper presentations, 15% of each group of respondents reported participation.

In all five specific subject areas examined, AMTs were more likely than non-AMTs to have conducted inservice workshops and to have supervised interns. In all areas except Exceptional Child Education, the AMT respondents were more likely to have participated in curriculum development projects, and in three of the five subject areas (excepting Elementary Education and Science Education) AMTs were more likely to have participated in state or district test development. Finally, in three of the five areas (except Elementary and Exceptional Child Education), AMTs were more likely to report having made paper presentations at professional conferences.

Professional Organizations. Respondents were asked to indicate professional organizations in which they held membership and their leadership positions, if any. The organizations identified by the respondents were classified into four broad groups:

1. Subject Field Associations: the nature of the organization being directly concerned with the subject area in which the respondent is teaching (e.g. math association, reading association).
2. General Curriculum/Research Associations: the nature of the organization being concerned with education or educational research in general (e.g. FERA, FATE).
3. Teacher Unions
4. Other Organizations

Candidates' responses are reported in Table 10. Most respondents reported membership in at least one subject field organization, less than one quarter of the respondents reported membership in a teacher union, and 12% reported membership in general curriculum/research associations. As shown in the table, a significantly higher proportion of Associate Master Teachers reported membership in subject field associations (64%) than non-AMTs (53%). Rates of membership in curriculum and research organizations, unions, and other organizations did not differ between the two groups of respondents. Similarly, the proportions of respondents who reported holding a leadership position in the organizations did not differ significantly between the two groups. Most leadership positions reported were in the subject field associations (22% and 19% for the AMTs and non-AMTs, respectively). In the remaining organization categories, 5% or

fewer of the respondents reported participation in a leadership capacity. More than 50% of the respondents in each specific subject field except Elementary Education reported membership in subject field associations. Among the five subject areas examined, the teachers at the elementary level showed the highest rates of membership in both general curriculum and research associations and teacher unions.

Other Awards

An effort was made to determine the extent to which program participants received previous civic/professional honors and recognition. Several survey items addressed the receipt of professional and civic honors, as well as the Teacher of the Year award nomination and selection process. Fourteen percent of the AMTs reported receiving professional honors, compared to 10% of the non-AMTs ($p<.05$). Twelve percent of each group of teachers reported receiving civic honors. Nearly half of the Associate Master Teachers in the respondent sample reported that they had been nominated for Teacher of the Year awards compared to 38% of the non-Associate Master Teacher respondents (a difference significant at the .01 level). A similar difference is seen in the rates of selection for Teacher of the Year awards. A significantly higher proportion of Associate Master Teachers (21%) reported being selected as Teacher of the Year compared to 14% of the non-AMTs ($p<.05$). On the subject area breakdown of awards and recognition, a greater proportion of AMTs received professional awards in all areas except Science Education. In four of the five

groups (the exception being Elementary Education), the AMT respondents reported fewer civic honors than the non-AMTs. With the exception of Exceptional Child Education, a greater proportion of AMTs in each subject area reported both nomination and selection for Teacher of the Year.

Conclusion

This study is exploratory in nature. The finding that years of teaching experience is unrelated to superior performance on the content knowledge test and classroom performance assessment is consistent with previous research in the field.

Although the differences between recipients and non-recipients of the Associate Master Teacher Award delineated in this survey are relatively small in magnitude, and not always consistent across the five subject areas investigated in further detail, a number of significant features contributing to a profile of the Florida Associate Master Teacher have been tentatively suggested. The Associate Master Teacher is typically a white female under 40 years of age who received a bachelor's degree in education from a Florida college or university. She most likely posesses a graduate degree and has about 14 years of teaching experience, most of which was gained in her present school district and all of which was gained in the state of Florida. She is certified to teach in two to three subject areas and seems more highly focused in this regard than her non-AMT colleagues. The Associate Master Teacher is likely to keep current in her field primarily through collegial

discussion, inservice workshops, and review of district and state materials, but she is also highly likely to supplement this by taking college courses and attending professional conferences. She is likely to have supervised interns, participated in curriculum development projects in her field, and is a member of at least one professional organization. Although she is more likely than her non-AMT peers to have received previous professional recognition, the AMT status is probably her first award for outstanding teaching performance.

References

A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, The Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession (May, 1986). New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Johnson, S. (1984). Merit pay for teachers: A poor prescription for reform. Harvard Education Review, 54, 175-185.

NCATE Redesign (April, 1985). National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.

Rosenholtz, S. (1985). Political myths about educational reform: Lessons from research on teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 349-355.

Shanker, A. (1985). Separating wheat from chaff. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 108-109.

Tommorrow's Teachers. A Report of the Holmes Group (1986). East Lansing: The Holmes Group, Inc.

Table 1
Survey Return Rates in Five Selected Subject Fields by Award Status

Subject Field	Award Status: AMT N	AMT %	Non-AMT N	Non-AMT %	Total N	Total %
Elementary Education	236	(52%)	332	(29%)	568	(36%)
English	43	(50%)	91	(32%)	134	(36%)
Exceptional Child Ed	68	(62%)	121	(41%)	189	(47%)
Mathematics	50	(50%)	80	(32%)	130	(37%)
Science	50	(50%)	99	(42%)	149	(44%)

Table 2
Within Subject Area Distributions by Gender

Subject Area		Gender	
		Male	Female
Elementary Education	AMT	5%	95%
	Non-AMT	11%	89%
English	AMT	16%	84%
	Non-AMT	12%	88%
Exceptional Child Education	AMT	4%	96%
	Non-AMT	12%	88%
Mathematics	AMT	37%	63%
	Non-AMT	44%	56%
Science	AMT	51%	49%
	Non-AMT	51%	49%

Table 3
Candidate Ethnic Distribution by Award Status

	Ethnic Group				
	White	Black	Hispanic	American Indian	Asian American
AMT	798 (95%)	16 (2%)	14 (2%)	1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)
Non-AMT	994 (93%)	41 (4%)	22 (2%)	3 (<1%)	2 (<1%)
Total	1792 (94%)	57 (3%)	36 (2%)	4 (<1%)	3 (<1%)

Chi-Square	8.919
df	4
p	n.s.

Table 4
Highest Degree Earned by Award Status

Award Status	Highest Degree Earned: Undergraduate N	%	Graduate N	%
AMT	154	(19%)	660	(81%)
Non-AMT	277	(26%)	773	(74%)
Total	431	(23%)	1433	(77%)

Chi-Square	14.363
df	1
p	<.01

Table 5
Number and Percentage of Respondents Who Earned Undergraduate Degrees In-State and Out-of-State by Award Status

Award Status	Degree Granting Institution: In-State N	In-State %	Out-of-State N	Out-of-State %
AMT	449	(57%)	339	(43%)
Non-AMT	507	(50%)	516	(50%)
Total	956	(53%)	855	(47%)

Chi-Square	9.832
df	1
p	<.01

Table 6
Number and Percentage of Respondents Who Earned Undergraduate Degrees from Colleges of Education vs. Other Colleges

Award Status	Bachelor's Degree Obtained From: College of Education N	%	Other College N	%
AMT	557	(70%)	241	(30%)
Non-AMT	747	(72%)	286	(28%)
Total	1304	(71%)	527	(29%)

Chi-Square	1.388
df	1
p	n.s.

Table 7
Number of Areas in Which Respondents are Certified to Teach

Award Status	Number of Certification Areas: 1 N	1 %	2-3 N	2-3 %	4 or more N	4 or more %
AMT	252	(31%)	460	(56%)	106	(13%)
Non-AMT	291	(28%)	539	(52%)	205	(20%)
Total	543	(29%)	999	(54%)	311	(17%)

Chi-Square	15.361
df	2
p	<.01

Table 8
Proportion of AMT and Non-AMT Respondents Reporting Use of Sources of Information on Teaching to Keep Abreast of Knowledge in Field

Source Of Information	Respondent Group			Chi-Square	p
	AMT	Non-AMT	Total		
Discussion with Colleagues	86%	86%	86%	0.01	ns
In-service Workshops	83%	81%	82%	0.94	ns
Summer Institutes	38%	40%	39%	0.75	ns
Professional Conferences	62%	53%	57%	16.21	<.01
College Texts	39%	28%	33%	24.18	<.01
College Courses	56%	48%	52%	11.31	<.01
Student Texts	44%	45%	45%	0.43	ns
District/State Materials	64%	62%	63%	0.92	ns

Table 9
Proportion of AMT and Non-AMT Respondents Reporting Participation in Five Professional Activities

Professional Activity	Respondent Group			Chi-Square	p
	AMT	Non-AMT	Total		
Conduct In-service Workshops	48%	38%	42%	20.99	<.01
Curriculum Development	62%	56%	59%	7.15	<.01
State/District Test Development	21%	20%	20%	0.36	ns
Intern Supervision	47%	41%	43%	8.26	<.01
Professional Paper Presentations	15%	15%	15%	0.12	ns

Table 10
Proportion of AMT and Non-AMT Respondents Reporting Membership and Leadership in Organizations

Organizations	Respondent Group			Chi-Square	p
	AMT	Non-AMT	Total		
Subject Field Associations					
Membership	64%	53%	58%	23.30	<.01
Leadership	22%	19%	20%	2.27	ns
General Curriculum/Research					
Membership	12%	12%	12%	0.01	ns
Leadership	3%	4%	4%	0.56	ns
Teacher Unions					
Membership	24%	24%	24%	0.01	ns
Leadership	5%	4%	5%	0.15	ns
Other Organizations					
Membership	3%	3%	3%	0.01	ns
Leadership	<1%	<1%	<1%	0.28	ns